DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 775 HE 002 281

AUTHOR	Creager, John A.
TITLE	Goals and Achievements of the ACE Internship Program in Academic Administration.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Office of Research.
REPORT NO	ACE-RR-Vol-6-NO-3
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel, Employment Patterns, *Evaluation, *Higher Education, *Internship Programs, Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	*Academic Administration Internship Program

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Academic Administration Internship Program is to enlarge the number and to improve the quality of persons available to fill key positions in academic administration. The program was designed to meet the following objectives: (1) to identify qualified people; (2) to select the most promising among those identified; and (3) to provide the selectees with experiences that would develop their potential to perform effectively in administrative positions directly related to academic areas. After briefly discussing the results of prior research on nomination, evaluation and selection, this report deals mainly with the results of the Career Status Followup Study, which included the sending of a Career Status (CSQ) to 106 former Fellows and 106 former nominees who did not receive the internship. In addition, the CSQ was sent to 83 participants in the ACE Academic Deans' Institutes in 1967 and 1968. The results indicated that there was a high intrinsic correlation between selection and experience as a Fellow and early attainment of a career position as an academic administrator. Some findings were also made regarding: (1) the nomination stage, (2) the dossier evaluation stage, (3) the interview stage, and (4) the internship experience. (AF)

OFFICE OF RESEARCH · AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Goals and Achievements of the ACE Internship Program in Academic Administration

JOHN A. CREAGER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VOL. 6 NO. 3 • 1971

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

LOGAN WILSON, *PRESIDENT*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Council's Office of Research was established in 1965 to assume responsibility for conducting research on questions of general concern to higher education. *ACE Research Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Office's research findings to a limited number of educational researchers and other interested persons.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

Alexander W. Astin
Director

Alan E. Bayer
Associate Director

RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
Robert F. Boruch
John A. Creager
David E. Drew
Jack E. Rossmann

VISITING SCHOLAR
Arthur W. Chickering

DATA PROCESSING STAFF
Jeffrey Dutton, *Chief*
Penny Edgert
Helen Frazier
Cynthia Haines
Eugene Hankinson
Shawne Lampert
Charles Sell

STAFF ASSISTANT
Barbara Blandford

SECRETARIES
Marilyn Block
Margo King
Jeannie Royer
Melvena Wimbs

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS
Ann Bisconti
Dianne Dutton
Ellen Kuper
Joan Trexler

EDITORIAL STAFF
Laura Kent

ACE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Nicholas Hobbs, *Chairman*
Provost, Vanderbilt University

Jessie Bernard
Research Scholar Honoris Causa
Pennsylvania State University

Allan M. Cartter
Chancellor
New York University

John G. Darley
Chairman, Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota

N. L. Gage
Professor of Education and Psychology
Stanford University

Richard C. Gilman
President
Occidental College

Edmond P. Gordon
Professor and Chairman, Department of Guidance
Teachers College
Columbia University

William Sewell
Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin

Carolyn Thornell
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
Columbia University

Ralph W. Tyler
Director Emeritus
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

Dael Wolfle
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Washington

Additional copies of this *Research Report* (Vol. 6, No. 3, 1971) may be obtained from the Office of Research, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ED051775

GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE ACE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM IN ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

John A. Creager

ACE RESEARCH REPORTS

Vol. 6, No. 3

April, 1971

Acknowledgements

When the author assumed responsibility for the research program discussed in this report, the basis of cooperation between persons responsible for the operational program and those responsible for the research program had already been established by Lanier Cox and Alexander W. Astin. This cooperation continued through the period that Max Lapham was responsible for the operational program and up to the present time. Charles G. Dobbins, current director of the program, and Douglas F. Bodwell, assistant director, have been generous with their time and encouragement.

David C. Knapp, Harry Marmion, and Charles Fisher have been most helpful in providing access to participants in the ACE Institutes for Academic Deans, thus providing the research staff with a relevant comparison group.

Extensive editorial assistance was provided by Laura Kent. Margo King patiently handled numerous other problems that arose in preparing this manuscript. Charles Sell provided assistance in computer operations, and Mrs. Helen Frazier provided data processing support. The help of these persons is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, no selection and evaluation research is possible without the cooperation of the persons who participated in a program of this kind, whether as the judge of a candidate at a home institution, a Fellow, a nonawarded nominee, a mentor or other colleague at a host institution, or a member of some comparison group. Some of these persons have been contacted several times over a period of nearly five years and have generously responded to requests for information. The author is certainly grateful for their help.

Table of Contents

		Page
	Acknowledgements	
	List of Tables	
I.	The ACE Academic Internship Program.	1
II.	Previous Documentation on Nomination, Evaluation, and Selection.	2
III.	The Career Status Followup Study.	6
IV.	"Hits" and Possible "Misses".	14
V.	Validation of Specific Evaluation and Selection Information Against Current Career Status. . . .	22
VI.	Validities of the Confidential Report Ratings. . . .	26
VII.	Summary and Conclusions.	32
VII.	References.	37
IX.	Technical Footnotes.	38
X.	Appendix A: The Career Status Questionnaire. . . .	41

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Career Positions Held by Fellows, Nonwinners, and Participants in Deans' Institutes at Three Points in Time	9
2.	Mean Frequency Levels of Participation in Decision-making	12
3.	Mean Percentage Time Spent and Mean Level of Personal Concern and Interests in Various Academic Problem Areas	13
4.	Salaries Reported by CSQ Respondents	15
5.	Percentages Within Groups Reporting Various Activities	16
6.	Distributions of Nominees into Outcome Groups	19
7.	Condensed Outcome Table, All Classes Combined	20
8.	Point-Biserial Validities of Preinternship Ratings Against Acceptance/Rejection and Career Status Criteria	24
9.	Point-Biserial Validities of Confidential Report Ratings Against Career Status Criterion and Against Overall CR Rating	28

Goals and Achievements of the ACE Internship Program in Academic Administration

The Academic Administration Internship Program of the American Council on Education was established in 1964 under a grant from The Ford Foundation. The purpose of this program is to enlarge the number, and to improve the quality of persons available to fill key positions in academic administration. To fulfill this purpose, the program was designed to meet the following specific operating objectives: (1) to identify qualified people, (2) to select the most promising among those identified, and (3) to provide the selectees with experiences that would develop their potential to perform effectively in administrative positions directly related to academic areas.

Concurrently with the operational program, the ACE's Office of Research has conducted a program of research on various aspects of the operational program, particularly on the question of how well it is implementing its objectives. Although the small scale of the operational program limits the value of the research results, much useful information has been obtained and is documented in four previous reports, all of which provide considerable evidence that the program goals are being achieved. The previous studies dealt with the characteristics of participating institutions, the characteristics of nominees, the progress of nominees through the processes of evaluation to the point of their final selection as Fellows, and on their progress during the internship experience. The present report is focussed on the career status of Fellows, as compared with those nominees who were not selected, from one to three years after completion of their internship. Only at this point is it possible to determine more nearly whether the ultimate program goals are being achieved.

To lay a general foundation for the present report, a brief description of the program and of prior research results will precede the discussion

of the followup study of career status.

Previous Documentation on Nomination, Evaluation, and Selection

The four previous reports, as well as the present one, are based on research done on the first three years of the program. Cox (1966) described the objectives and initial operating structure. Astin (1966) presented the initial research results from the first year of the program, concentrating on the characteristics of participating institutions, the nominees, the evaluation and selection process, and the selected Fellows. Creager (1966, 1971) presented similar information for the second and third years of the program, respectively, comparing the results obtained for each of the three different classes. The last of these reports included information, not previously published, on the evaluation of nominees by their home institutions and on the immediate postinternship evaluations of the Fellows and their internship experience.

Wherever feasible, relevant control groups were used to provide comparative information. For example, nominees have been compared with faculty members who reported having no interest in academic administration, and Fellows have been compared with deans and other academic administrators who had already assumed positions of academic leadership. Moreover, at each stage of evaluation, Fellows have been compared with nonwinners.

With minor variations the evaluation and selection procedures were highly similar during the first three years of the program, and the research results were generally consistent. In each class year, the presidents of the member institutions of the Council were asked to nominate a person considered to have outstanding promise for a career in academic administration. Participation by public institutions and universities had been proportionately

greater than that by liberal arts, two-year, and church-related colleges, or by technical institutions.

The presidents were also asked to choose three persons familiar with the nominee and have them complete a structured evaluation form consisting of a set of ratings on their nominees. These Home Evaluation ratings contained unique and relevant information and were made a part of the dossier. They were of special value in that raters at the home institutions had observed the nominee over a period of time, and in several situations, in contrast to those who provide ratings in later stages of evaluation.

Each nominee submitted a dossier consisting of a letter of recommendation from the nominating president, graduate and undergraduate transcripts, an application form, and an essay on an assigned topic dealing with academic administration. The dossiers were initially screened by the staff of the Internship Program for administrative reasons and then evaluated by four-man teams composed of members of the professional staff of the Council. This evaluation resulted in an overall Dossier Rating, one from each judge, as Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Doubtful, or Unacceptable as potential academic administrators. The data from the dossier were also used to characterize the nominee groups and to study the parts of the dossier that most greatly influenced the Mean Dossier Rating.

Beginning with the fourth year of the program, certain changes were introduced. The participating institutions were invited to establish and support internships on their own campuses or at a host campus. The evaluation and selection of Fellows is similar to the pattern followed in the first three years, with preference being given to potential academic officers, such as academic deans and vice presidents, in contrast to admissions and fiscal officers. The results of research on the first three classes are therefore

relevant to the continuing program.

The nominee is likely to come from the ranks of faculty. He may hold his highest degree in any one of a broad range of academic disciplines. However, nominees are much more likely than the typical faculty member to have had some administrative experience, and to be more self-confident, outgoing, and socially active. The more recent nominee seems to possess the characteristics, aptitudes, and attitudes that are judged to be most important in the evaluation and selection process. This trend in the characteristics of the nominee group occurred primarily between the second and third year, at a time when program objectives and desired characteristics of nominees had become more clearly defined. Evaluators of the dossiers seem to place the greatest emphasis on the nominee's past scholarly achievements and on the ratings he receives from his home institution on personality traits and on acceptability as a dean.

In the first year of the program, all nominees were interviewed by teams consisting of college presidents and members of the executive staff of the Council. These interviews, which constituted a second stage in the evaluation process, resulted in an additional set of ratings of nominees prior to final selection or rejection. Astin (1966) found that the Mean Dossier Rating was a good predictor ($\underline{r}$ = .66) of the final Overall Rating from the interview, so that the dossier evaluation came to be used as a prescreening device, reducing the number of persons to be interviewed and the costs involved in the interviewing process. The relationship on which this decision was based has held up rather well in subsequent years (correlations are estimated to be in the .50-.60 range). The differences between the dossier and the interview evaluations were great enough, however, to provide

some justification for retaining the two-stage evaluation procedure. The interview evaluations emphasize intellectual skills and personality traits as expressed in direct personal confrontation, in contrast to the less direct picture presented by the self-reports and ratings in the dossier.

Consistently, those nominees finally selected have been more likely than nonwinners to hold a doctoral degree, to receive higher salaries, to have produced some scholarly publications, and to show a stronger interest in academic administration. The Fellows are also more like deans and other academic administrators in these respects than are the nonwinners. Similar differences were found between nominees and faculty control groups in these characteristics. In short, the Internship Program has been successful in achieving the first two of its objectives: to identify, and to select, qualified persons with potential for development into academic administrators.

Moreover, the previously reported findings gave support to the tentative conclusion that the third operational objective -- providing selectees with experiences that will aid in their development as academic administrators -- was also being achieved. This conclusion is based not only on reports by the Fellows themselves about their internship experience but also on confidential reports -- evaluations of the Fellow's growth and performance during the internship year made by the mentor and others at the host institution who are in a position to observe that performance. These sources of information have yielded consistent results regardless of program year.

According to reports by former Fellows, the internship experience provided them with wider professional contacts, enabled them to learn new administrative techniques, gave them experience in new problem areas, and

deepened their understanding of the interrelationships among administrative problems. Moreover, they developed greater insight into national problems and their interface with higher education, a deeper personal philosophy of higher education, and a more complete self-insight. The data indicate that these benefits come primarily through contacts and discussions with mentors, administrators, and faculty, and through opportunities to observe administrative operations. The host institution benefits as well, in that the intern performs staff studies and other services, and often brings a fresh perspective to institutional problems.

This brief summary of the operational structure of the program during its first three years, and of the results of prior research, provides background for the career status followup study. Although the results of prior research were strongly indicative that program objectives are being met, examination of the later career status of nominees, in which the selected Fellows are compared with nonwinners, provides a stronger test of program success. Moreover, some of the resulting information may suggest possible improvements in the program. The major question to be answered by the followup study is: are those who are selected and who have the internship experience more likely to be in positions where they function as academic administrators than are the nonwinners?

The Career Status Followup Study

A longer range followup study in which sufficient time has elapsed for career progression patterns to have been established should provide the kind of criterion information necessary for external validation of the evaluation and selection procedures and of the internship experience itself. Although five years after the internship period might be a more reasonable

point in time for the followup of each nominee group, it was judged desirable to reduce the time lag allowed for former Fellows to achieve career status. Moreover, since the respondent group was expected to be small, it was decided to form the followup sample by combining the nominees for the first three years of the program (1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68). Accordingly a Career Status Questionnaire (CSQ) was mailed to 106 former Fellows and to 106 former nominees who did not receive an ACE internship. In addition the questionnaire was sent to 83 participants in the ACE Academic Deans' Institutes in 1967 and 1968, who were regarded as constituting a relevant comparison group. No attempt was made to follow-up those faculty members who had participated in earlier studies as members of control groups. The presumption is that this group remains predominantly engaged in teaching and research and has little interest in playing a major role in academic administration. The predominant focus in the followup was one of comparing former winners with nonwinners and to use the data supplied by deans as the reference for comparison of achievement of relevant career status.

Usable returns were obtained from 90 percent of the former Fellows, 57 percent of the nonwinners, and 82 percent of the Deans' Institutes participants. Although it is typical that the nonwinners in a selection program are less likely to respond to mail followups, the difficulty is compounded here because addresses of Fellows and Deans have been kept up to date, but those for the rejected nominees were essentially the ones obtained at nomination.

The Career Status Questionnaire (CSQ), administered in the fall of 1969, elicits information on changes in academic positions from those held five years ago, and three years ago, to the one presently held. It also contains items on how frequently the respondent was involved in various areas

of decision making in academic affairs, the percent time spent and degree of personal interest in various academic problem areas, salary information, and participation in a small group of related activities. A copy of the questionnaire will be found in Appendix A.

For each followup group the numbers and percentages of persons holding various academic positions over a period of time are presented in Table 1. Because these positions often carried faculty status and were not in other ways mutually exclusive, especially in small institutions, the percentages generally totaled more than 100 percent. Both the positions held at the time of the survey and changes over time indicate that program objectives are being met. Relatively more former Fellows were currently in academic administration, but more nonwinners were in faculty positions and departmental chairmanships. Eight of the nonwinners (i.e., 13 percent) reported that they had participated in academic management development programs under some other sponsorship. Four of these have become academic deans or vice presidents, one a development officer and one an official connected with academic administrative matters in a state department of higher education. Practically all academic deans are still deans or have become academic vice presidents.

The total sample of 155 former nominees was divided into two groups according to whether their current positions are consistent with program objectives. This division was later refined to take into account additional information about their functions. The classification was clear for those respondents checking explicit categories; however, 21 percent of the former Fellows reported that their current position was "other or none." Special investigation revealed that over one-half of this group was in academic administration, but had titles not exactly fitting the explicit response

Table 1

Career Positions Held by Fellows, Nonwinners, and Participants in Deans' Institutes at Three Points in Time
(N = 223 Respondents to CSQ)

Position	Percentage Within Group Holding Position								
	Currently			3 Years Ago			5 Years Ago		
	Fellows (N=95)	Nonwinners (N=60)	Deans (N=68)	Fellows (N=95)	Nonwinners (N=60)	Deans (N=68)	Fellows (N=95)	Nonwinners (N=60)	Deans (N=68)
Department Chairman	12	33	3	19	20	21	14	20	25
President, Small 4-Yr. College	9	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
President, 2-Yr. College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
President, University	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Vice-president	20	5	26	3	0	12	0	0	3
Academic Dean	25	18	62	13	10	50	5	5	16
Student Dean	3	2	0	5	3	0	3	0	1
Fiscal Officer	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	1
Development Officer	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	3	1
Full Professor	26	45	25	18	33	18	15	20	31
Associate Professor	23	13	4	41	25	12	40	32	15
Other or None	21	12	4	19	13	7	18	13	13

categories on the questionnaire: e.g., administrative assistant to the president, graduate dean, assistant graduate dean, assistant academic dean, and director of a special academic program. The remainder included two directors of research, the trustee of a small college, two in institutional research, one currently with the U. S. Office of Education, and one affiliated with a regional association of colleges.

With this resolution of the "other or none" respondents to the current position item, and their addition to the two groups defined by those checking explicit categories, we find that 54 percent (84 out of 155) of the total sample of former nominees have become academic administrators. Since it is unlikely that such a percentage of the faculties from which nominations are made would have become academic administrators in such a short time, it is apparent that the initial nominations by the presidents have already been helpful in identifying qualified persons. With this base rate of achievement of career status as an academic administrator in the total nominee group in mind, it is even more striking to note that 76 percent (72 out of 95) of the former Fellows, but only 20 percent (12 out of 60) of the nonwinners became academic administrators. Thus, it is obvious that the subsequent evaluation, selection, and internship experience of the Fellows serves the goals of the program.

Even without the refinement of resolving the "other or none" category for positions held at earlier points in time, Fellows and nonwinners were quite comparable five years earlier in their distribution among positions and are now quite different with much more shifting of the Fellows into the administrative categories. Moreover, the distribution of former Fellows into currently held positions resembles that of the deans, who are relatively young and recently appointed.

CSQ respondents were asked to indicate whether they participated in certain areas of academic decision making frequently, occasionally, or rarely. The mean response for each group in each of the specified areas is presented in Table 2. The pattern is congruent with that for positions held. Former Fellows and Deans participated more frequently in decision making in these areas than did nonwinners except in the area of deciding about individual course content where the nonwinners (still mostly teaching faculty) played the greater role. Even though the deans participated more frequently in decision making than did the entire group of nominees, in all areas the mean frequencies for Fellows lie between those of the nonwinners and those of the Deans.

The functions currently carried out by the CSQ respondents were examined in terms of the mean percentage of time spent and the mean level of personal interest or concern in each of 16 problem areas (Table 3). Former Fellows were more similar to the Deans than to the nonwinners; they spent more time and expressed more interest in all administrative matters, while the pattern was reversed for teaching and research.

All but five CSQ respondents (two fellows and three deans) answered the question about annual salary, before taxes and exclusive of fringe benefits and consulting and lecture fees. Frequency distributions of reported salaries with medians for all three groups are presented in Table 4. Not only were former Fellows making a higher median salary, approaching that of the Deans, than were the nonwinners, but the difference increased from what it was when both groups were nominees. As nominees the overall differential was about $1400 a year but had nearly doubled to $2600. This pattern was not completely uniform for all three classes; nevertheless, the picture is striking for the pooled followup group. To be sure, increased

Table 2

Mean Frequency Levels of Participation in Decision-making[a]
(N = 223 Respondents to CSQ)

Area of Decision	Fellows (N=95)	Nonwinners (N=60)	Deans (N=68)	Significance[b] Summary
Admissions Policies	1.96	1.73	2.24	D/F & NW
Faculty Policies	2.31	2.22	2.87	D/F & NW
Financial Affairs & Capital Improvements	2.07	1.77	2.53	D/F & NW, F/NW
Student Affairs	2.09	1.95	2.15	(NSD)
Formal Public & Alumni Relations	1.75	1.63	1.91	(NSD)
Individual Course Content	1.95	2.27	1.81	F/NW, D/NW
Curriculum Structure	2.43	2.37	2.66	D/F & NW

[a]Frequency Levels are: 3 = Frequently
2 = Occasionally
1 = Rarely

[b]Differences significant at the .05 level. D/F & NW indicates that deans differ significantly from Fellows and nonwinners. NSD indicates there was no significant difference. No significant differences were found between Fellows and nonwinners on these items, but differences favor the Fellows.

Table 3

Mean Percentage Time Spent and Mean Level of Personal Concern and Interests in Various Academic Problem Areas[a]

(N = 223 Respondents to CSQ)

Problem Area	Mean Percent Time				Mean Level of Concern			
	Fellows	Nonwinners	Deans	Signif.[b]	Fellows	Nonwinners	Deans	Signif.[b]
Faculty Relations	12	7	19	D/F/NW	2.43	1.92	2.81	D/F/NW
Budget	8	4	10	D/NW,F/NW	2.08	1.67	2.29	D/NW
Curriculum	9	7	13	D/F , NW	2.34	2.27	2.74	D/F, NW
Physical Plant	2	1	3	D/NW	1.23	1.27	1.54	D/F
Public Relations	3	5	4	NSD	1.72	1.67	1.90	NSD
Student Unrest	5	2	4	D/NW, F/D	2.07	1.62	2.16	D/NW,F/NW
Other Student Problems	3	4	3	NSD	1.51	1.47	1.72	NSD
Development and Fund Raising	2	2	2	NSD	1.41	1.12	1.41	NSD
Financial Aid	1	1	1	NSD	1.36	1.40	1.29	NSD
Alumni Relations	1	1	2	NSD	1.19	1.25	1.43	NSD
Administrative Coordination	14	11	16	D/NW	2.26	2.08	2.59	D/F, NW
Institutional Research & Program Planning	9	6	6	NSD	2.22	1.92	2.37	D/NW
Teaching	14	25	5	D/F/NW	2.07	2.20	1.90	NSD
Research	5	9	2	D/F/NW	1.86	1.90	1.65	NSD
Research Administration	3	4	1	D/NW	1.35	1.52	1.09	D/NW

[a]Levels of Concern and Interest: 3 = High
2 = Medium
1 = Low

[b]Significance comments; see footnote b of Table 2 for explanation.

salaries are not, per se, an objective of the program, but they do suggest that those who participated in the ACE internship program are recognized and rewarded for their worth.

The various activities of the different groups are presented in Table 5. With the exception of civic affairs, where nonwinners were more likely to be active than were the Deans and the Deans in turn more active than former Fellows, the Fellows and Deans again were similar in the percentages who reported engagement in a given activity. However, more of the Fellows than Deans reported giving lectures for remuneration, serving as consultants, and having published articles or books on administrative policy issues in higher education. With respect to lecturing, consulting, and publishing -- academic activities where communication serves the formation and dissemination of policy -- the Fellows were significantly more active than the nonwinners. It is interesting to note that some former Fellows have already served as mentors to subsequent Fellows.

"Hits" and Possible "Misses"

The patterns shown in Tables 1 through 5, with respect to differences in the positions, roles, functions, and activities of former Fellows and nonwinners, were markedly consistent, indicating not only that program objectives are being met but also that these differences are pertinent to academic administration, as measured by the greater similarity of career status of Fellows to that of the Deans. But are these differences primarily attributable to the effectiveness of evaluation and selection procedures or to the ACE internship experience, itself? The evidence indicates that both play an important role. The greater visibility of Fellows may also be a factor in their more rapid progression into academic administrative

Table 4

Salaries Reported by CSQ Respondents

(N = 223)

	Fellows (N=95)			Nonwinners (N=60)			Deans (N=68)		
Salary	f	%	Cumulative %	f	%	Cumulative %	f	%	Cumulative %
Less than $10,000	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
$10,000-$14,999	12	13	14	16	27	27	3	5	7
$15,000-$19,999	38	41	55	25	42	69	21	32	40
$20,000-$24,999	30	32	87	15	25	94	23	35	75
$25,000-$29,999	9	10	97	3	5	99	14	21	96
$30,000-$34,999	2	2	99	1	1	100	2	3	99
$35,000 or more	1	1	100	0	0	100	1	1	100
Not reported	2	---	---	0	---	---	3	---	---
Median	$19,407			$16,842			$21,630		

Table 5

Percentages Within Groups Reporting Various Activities

Activity	Fellows (N=95)	Nonwinners (N=60)	Deans (N=68)	Significance[a]
Civic Affairs	56	70	62	None
Lecturing	83	65	76	F/NW
Consulting	64	48	62	F/NW
Publishing	35	15	22	F/NW
Serving as Mentor	8	2	16	D/NW

[a]F/NW indicates a difference between Fellows and nonwinners significant at the .05 level; D/NW indicates similar significant difference between deans and nonwinners.

careers, but even that would not be likely if the more qualified nominees were not being selected as Fellows.

To clarify some of these points and to seek clues about how to improve the program, the two nominee groups (Fellows and nonwinners) were each divided into two subgroups: those who have become academic administrators, in the sense of program objectives, and those who have not. The distinction, usually obvious from the CSQ data, was based primarily on whether the person had in fact become an administrator of academic affairs beyond the level of department chairman; generally excluded were nonacademic administration positions and functions such as budgetary or fiscal officer, teaching faculty, and research faculty. In higher education, some people serve more than one function or hold special kinds of positions, resulting in some borderline cases. For present purposes, such people were usually judged to have arrived at positions consistent with program objectives. First, the research staff divided the 155 nominees who responded to the CSQ into groups on the basis of their present position, changes in positions over the past few years, and percentage of time spent in various functions; these classifications were reviewed by the staff of the Internship Program with virtually complete agreement about the resulting assignment of subjects to the four criterion groups. Although this procedure risks criterion contamination with respect to the internship status of the subject, it also ensures that the criterion group definition is consistent with program objectives. Every effort was made to judge each case on the objective evidence in the CSQ and to do so consistently.

Frequency distributions of the four career status groups defined by becoming or not becoming an academic administrator and by the fellowship status of the nominees are presented in Tables 6 and 7. Table 6 shows these

distributions for each program year and for the total sample of nominee respondents to the CSQ. Also shown are the percentages in each outcome group computed against the within-year grand totals, except that those corresponding to cell totals and marginal totals are based on the total of 155 nominees. A condensed table for the total sample, with all three classes combined, is presented as Table 7. The overall relation between former internship status and current status as an academic administrator is shown by the correlational statistics presented with Table 7.

The phi coefficient of .547 is very highly significant; the odds are less than one in a thousand that this result is attributable to random sampling errors. Conversion of this validity to an estimate of the intrinsic validity of the program operations results in the very encouraging value of .63.[1]

If the evaluation and selection procedures have excluded those who do not later become administrators (Group D) and have accepted those who do (Group A), program objectives are being met. We may call these cases "hits." On this basis the general "betting average" for the program is 77.5 percent (74.0, 76.3, and 78.4, respectively for the three classes). The 22.5 percent of the total sample from Groups B (Fellows who have not as yet become academic administrators) and C (nonwinners who are in academic administration) appear to be "misses." But this conclusion requires qualification. One must remember that Fellows and nonwinners differed in their response rates to the CSQ and that the total sample consists of respondents from three different classes. It is likely that enough time (about three years) has elapsed since the internship period of the first class so that we can assume that the first-year nominees are fairly firmly established in academic administration or in some other area, but the same may not be true

Table 6

Distributions of Nominees into Outcome Groups[a]

(N = 155)

Career Status	Year of Program	Fellows		Nonwinners		Total	
		Group A (Hits)		Group C (Misses)			
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Have become academic administrators	1st	13	37.1	6	17.1	19	54.2
	2nd	32	46.4	4	5.8	36	52.2
	3rd	27	52.9	2	3.9	29	56.8
	Total	72	(46.5)	12	(7.7)	84	(54.2)
		Group B (Misses)		Group D (Hits)			
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Have not become academic administrators	1st	1	2.9	15	42.9	16	45.8
	2nd	12	17.4	21	30.4	33	47.8
	3rd	10	19.6	12	23.5	22	43.1
	Total	23	(14.8)	48	(31.0)	71	(44.8)
TOTAL	1st	14	40.0	21	60.0	35	22.6
	2nd	44	63.8	25	36.2	69	44.5
	3rd	37	72.5	14	27.5	51	32.9
	Total	95	(71.3)	60	(38.7)	155	(100.0)

[a]Percentages are computed against within year grant totals except in the lower right cell where percents are computed against total of 155 cases, as are the cell totals.

Table 7

Condensed Outcome Table, All Classes Combined

(N = 155)

Outcome	Statistic	Fellows	Nonwinners	Total
		Group A (Hits)	Group C (Misses)	
Have become academic administrators	N	72	12	84
	% of Administrators	85.7	14.3	100.0
	% of Column Total	75.8	20.0	---
	% of Total	46.5	7.7	54.2
		Group B (Misses)	Group D (Hits)	
Have not become academic administrators	N	23	48	71
	% of Nonadministrators	32.4	67.6	100.0
	% of Column Total	24.2	80.0	---
	% of Total	14.8	31.0	45.8
Total	N	95	60	155
	% of Total	61.3	38.7	100.0

$\underline{\phi} = .547$

$\underline{\phi \text{ max}} = .864$

$\underline{\phi/\phi \text{ max}} = .633$

$\underline{X^2} = 46.38$ ($\underline{p}$ .001 with 1 df)

of those respondents in the second and third years of the program. As time passes, many of the respondents -- both Fellows and nonwinners -- who are not now academic administrators (Groups B and D) may move into that field. Conversely, the shift may be in the other direction: A person may try administrative work for a while and then decide to return to research or teaching. With the passage of time, shifts from Group B to Group A will increase the "betting average," while those from Group D into Group C will lower it. The net result may well be only a negligible change in the 77.5 percent "hits" found to date.

It is instructive to take a closer look at the apparent "misses." Those in Group B (former Fellows who have not yet fulfilled their promise) frequently indicated that they hoped and expected to take administrative positions during the next five years. One of the program objectives is to form a pool of identified potential administrators and to give them the special internship experience, rather than to fill existing vacancies on a crash basis.

What about those in Group C, nominees who were not awarded an internship but who already have become academic administrators? In any selection program, especially one with a pool of high-level nominees and a moderate selection ratio, one must expect to find some well qualified persons among the nonwinners. Moreover, being nominees, their interest in and potential for administrative functions had already been recognized at the home institution. In spite of these considerations an attempt was made to ascertain whether these apparently inaccurate eliminations were occurring at the dossier or interview stages of evaluation. The results are equivocal. Of the twelve persons involved, six were from the first year of the program when the dossier screen was not used, four were from the second year of the program

and were interview eliminees, and the two remaining from the third year of the program were dossier eliminees.

Validation of Specific Evaluation and Selection Information Against Current Career Status

The results presented in Tables 6 and 7 provide strong support for the overall validity of the operational program in meeting its objectives. Although prior reports have shown internal evidence of the relevance and validity of the specific information obtained and used during program operations, the availability of career status followup data permits external validation of such specific information against achievement or nonachievement of status as an academic administrator. The criterion of "having arrived" carries no necessary connotation of high quality performance, but this may be presumed to some extent on the basis of anecdotal information available to program administrators, and on the previously cited indication of rapid career progression of former Fellows.

It will be recalled that several kinds of ratings have been used: Home Evaluations, Dossier, Interview, and Confidential Reports. For a number of reasons the validities for specific items of information tend to be low. First, they can be computed only for those who returned the CSQ. Second, not all types of evaluations were used in all three years of the program or on all groups. In view of these and other technical problems, no attempt will be made to discuss validities in terms of statistical significance. Instead, we examine the patterns of validities with respect to their conformance with program objectives, to their agreement with previously reported results, and to their implications for possible improvement in evaluation and selection procedures.

For the latter purpose it will be useful to compare validities computed in the followup sample against the award/reject criterion with those against the career status criterion. Where the award/reject validites are markedly smaller than those for the career status criterion, the implication is that the item may be more useful or given greater weight in the program operations than has been the case. Conversely, where a validity against the award/reject criterion is greater than that against career status, the item may not be as important for selecting potential administrators as prior use suggests. Care must be taken, however, that such items are not rejected solely on this basis, because they may be measuring some attribute considered to be desirable in administrators, or because they may predict actual quality of administrative performance, rather than quick attainment of administrative status.

Table 8 shows the validities of the Home Evaluation, Dossier, and Interview ratings for both the career status and the award/reject criteria. Although the validity of the Mean Dossier Rating (.12) and those of the Overall Rating (.11 for Home Evaluation and .19 for the Interview) against career status are very modest, the higher validity for the Overall Interview Rating suggests that the interview procedure is probably yielding unique information about a nominee's chances of later becoming an administrator. More important, finding some specific ratings to have higher, and some lower, validities against the career status than the validity of an Overall Rating indicates that improved evaluation would result if individual rating scales were given somewhat different emphasis than they now receive. In the case of the dossier, which consists in part of the Home Evaluation ratings, ten of the eleven subscales also used in the interview ratings may be getting too much weight. Only the Intelligence rating may be underweighted.

Table 8

Point-Biserial Validities of Preinternship Ratings Against Acceptance/Rejection and Career Status Criteria

Rating Scale Criterion	Home Evaluation Ratings		Interview Ratings	
	Award	Career Status	Award	Career Status
Poise	.18	.06	.24	.25
Extent of Speech	-.10	.11	-.03	-.09
Quality of Speech	.08	.06	.31	.08
Personal Appearance	.11	.01	.24	.11
Aggression	-.23	-.15	.12	-.03
Intelligence	.12	.22	.30	.12
Cultural Level	.02	-.04	.32	.13
Candor	.21	.06	.23	.19
Enthusiasm	.05	.05	.18	.05
Conviction	-.16	.06	-.01	-.07
Ability in Interpersonal Relations	.28	.01	.49	.22
Overall	---	.11	---	.30
Dependability	.20	.15	---	---
Personality [a]	.28	.05	---	---
Acceptability as Dean [a]	.17	.16	---	---
Administrative Knowledge [a]	.13	.32	---	---
Mean Dossier Rating	.31	.12	---	---

[a] Signs of correlations reversed to compensate for reversed coding of scale on questionnaire.

It should be recalled that the raters at the home institutions understandably tend to give high ratings to the nominee. Moreover, each person is rated by some local standard rather than by comparison with the other nominees.

The same limitations apply to the ratings on the other four scales. These scales are unique in the sense that they are not explicitly rated anywhere else in the system. Two of them, Dependability and Acceptability as a Dean, are apparently given plausible weights in the dossier evaluation. The Personality rating appears to be overweighted. The previously reported correlation of .20 between the Administrative Knowledge rating with the Dossier rating and its present validity of .13 against the award criterion indicate that ratings on this scale are receiving some attention in the evaluation and selection process, but less than they should be, since these validities are smaller than for most of the other Home Evaluation ratings. Yet the rating on Administrative Knowledge has the largest validity (.32) against the career status criterion. Even in its present form it could probably be given greater weight in the Dossier evaluation. It would be possible to obtain this information directly from the nominees as part of the dossier (or interview) so that more meaningful score differences could be established among the nominees. Moreover, the present single item involves several related ideas about "knowledge and understanding of the functioning of an academic institution and relationships among its essential components -- faculty, students, administration, governing body." Thus, it might be useful to replace the single item with four separate items, one for each component.

Validity coefficients were also computed for the other major portion of the dossier, the application form completed by the nominee. The usefulness of the Undergraduate Grade Point Average was confirmed by correlations

of .16 against career status criterion and .12 against the award criterion. A subgroup of the sample were assistant deans at the time of nomination; the validities were .18 for career status and .11 for award. All other validities for information coded from the application form and computed against the career status criterion were of doubtful significance or interpretability. Nevertheless, much of this information bears on the quality of the nominee and is also useful in program administration.

The previously demonstrated relationship between the interview ratings and the decision to grant an award is confirmed here, with essentially the same pattern of validities for the individual scales. The validities against the career status criterion, however, are generally lower, and the patterns are somewhat different. The validities of the interview ratings of Poise and Candor justify the attention currently given to these ratings, as does the validity of Ability in Interpersonal Relations, though to a lesser extent. But, perhaps too much emphasis is being given to Quality of Speech, Personal Appearance, Intelligence (in the interview situation) and Cultural Level. But here again, caution is indicated because these may well be desirable traits in those who are selected and eventually become academic administrators, regardless of whether they predict early attainment of such career status.

Validities of the Confidential Report Ratings

In contrast to the ratings of various traits and behaviors obtained in evaluating nominees and used in selecting Fellows, the Confidential Reports of Intern Performance emphasize actual growth and performance of the Fellow during his internship, as evaluated by his mentor and other persons at the host institution. The two traits of Initiative and Persistence are not rated in the evaluation and selection procedures and the Overall rating

is directly relevant to administrative ability as demonstrated during the internship. Many of the Confidential Report ratings bear on later expectations about the quality of future performance in specific academic positions. Such considerations may account for the lack of a demonstrable relationship of the Dossier and Interview Ratings with the Confidential Report ratings. Moreover, as in the case of the Home Evaluation ratings, each person is rated locally rather than in comparison with the other nominees. The validities of the Confidential Report ratings against the career status criterion are presented in Table 9 with the corresponding validities against the Overall Rating of Administrative Ability as demonstrated during the internship.

Against the Career status criterion, the Overall rating had only minimal validity as did the ratings of Administrative Judgment and Achievement on Specific Assignments. In contrast, the higher validity of ratings on Growth During Internship are encouraging, since they suggest that the internship experience is having a positive impact on the Fellow. Particularly impressive is the relatively high validity of the ratings on Persistence; obviously some attempt should be made to obtain such a rating during the evaluation and selection procedures, and perhaps even in the Home Evaluations. Validities (not shown) for ratings about relations with various kinds of academic personnel were systematically negligible or spurious. The difficulty, as previously reported, is that contacts between Fellows and other academic persons cannot easily be observed with sufficient consistency to permit reliable ratings.

Another part of the Confidential Report asked the rater whether he would have recommended the subject both for an internship and to fill an appropriate administrative vacancy; the correlation between these two items

Table 9

Point-Biserial Validities of Confidential Report Ratings Against Career Status Criterion and Against Overall CR Rating[a]

CR Rating Scale	Career Status Validity	Overall Rating Validity
Administrative Judgment	.12	.80
Achievement of Specific Assignments	.17	.68
Growth During Internship	.19	.65
Initiative	.15	.74
Persistence	.32	.68
Overall Administrative Ability	.14	---
Would have recommended for:		
Internship	.24	.74
Filling Administrative Vacancy	.18	.70
Would Expect Quality Performance as:		
Department Chairman	.03	.54
President of Small College	.15	.67
President of Junior College	.18	.48
President of Large University	.03	.50
Academic Vice-President	.19	.67
Academic Dean	.11	.60
Dean of Students	.02	.13
Chief Budget Officer	-.12	.14
Chief Development Officer	.21	.29
Distinguished Professor	.02	.34
Mean Dossier Rating	.02	.14
Overall Interview Rating	-.09	.08

[a]Fellows only

was previously demonstrated to be very high. High ratings on these items imply an approval of the selection of the ratee as a Fellow. It is therefore somewhat encouraging to find that these items have appreciable validities against the career status criterion. Moreover, allowing for fluctuations to be expected in these coefficients, the pattern of validities for expectations of future performance in various administrative positions is also encouraging. In short, these ratings of Fellows after their internship has been completed are not only indicative of successful selection, but also of future achievement of administrative career positions.

The general picture given by the validities of the Confidential Report ratings, taken in conjunction with the low relationship to the evaluation and selection procedures, indicates that something is happening in the internship situation that is helpful to the achievement of career status as an academic administrator. The comments of both Fellows and mentors, previously summarized, on the values of internship to them as persons and to the host institutions enhances this picture.

The overall validity of the program demonstrated by the data presented in Tables 6 and 7 combines the validity of initial selection of Fellows with the validity of the internship experience for those who were selected. The same consideration applies to the validities of the specific evaluation and selection variables, because only those nominees selected have the opportunity to be affected by the internship experience. It is, of course, a matter of considerable interest to the program to be able to separate the effects of the internship experience from those of the selection and evaluation process. Therefore, two kinds of analyses were undertaken to effect this separation and to provide some indication of the relative impact of the two phases of the program.

In the first analysis, some indication of the effect of the internship experience per se can be seen by comparing the validity of the Confidential Report ratings based on performance and growth during the internship with the validity of the selection variables within the group of selected Fellows. If the greater likelihood that Fellows will become administrators is primarily a function of selection, the validities of the selection variables should be of a similar magnitude to, or greater than the validities of the Confidential Report Ratings. Conversely, if the internship experience increases the probability of a Fellows' becoming an administrator, the validities of the mentor ratings should be not only positive, but also greater than those for the selection variables.[2]

The validities of the dossier and overall interview ratings, computed within the group of Fellows, are given at the bottom of Table 9. That the Confidential Report ratings have higher validities supports the hypothesis that the internship experience increases the probability of early attainment of administrative status. The negative correlation (within the selected group of Fellows) for the interview rating suggests that the internship experience may be more beneficial to those judged in the interview to be acceptable but not outstanding, possibly because they have more "room to grow."

In the second analysis, using all available data on the total nominee group, the multiple correlation of each set of variables was compared with that computed using both the selection variables and the Confidential Report Ratings.[3] The result is a multiple correlation of .64 for the combined effects of selection and of the internship experience, a result which agrees closely with the intrinsic relationship (.63) estimated from the data in Table 7. We also find a multiple correlation of .25 for the selection variables (Dossier and Interview ratings), and a multiple correlation of .43 for the mentor ratings

in the postinternship Confidential Reports. The latter emphasized the Overall rating of the Fellow's internship performance and his growth during the internship.

Thus the two methods for separating the impact of the internship experience from that of the selection process agree in their indication that the internship experience itself has favorable effects, not wholly attributable to the selection process. Moreover, the results of the second method show that both the selection process and the internship experience contribute to a successful outcome, but that the internship experience may be the stronger of the two contributions (.43 versus .25, cited above). Nevertheless, one should remember that these results are computed on the nominee group after the Home Evaluations have been made and selection for nomination has occurred. Moreover, the evidence shows that the evaluation and selection process also plays a significant role in the total program. The large increase in multiple correlation that results from combining information from both selection and internship experience results, in part, from these two aspects of the program accomplishing two different goals and, as previously mentioned, there is little relationship between the preinternship evaluation variables and the postinternship ratings of the Fellow's growth and performance during his internship experience.

With this particular criterion for validation, it is possible that the apparently strong effect of the internship experience means that the Fellows, not only because they were selected but also because their qualities were apparent to their mentors, have very rapidly become highly visible as potential academic administrators. While not a part of the program design, visibility is consistent with program objectives.

Summary and Conclusions

The results of the research done on the internship program, especially those of the present followup validation, justify the conclusion that the ACE Academic Administration Internship Program has been highly successful in meeting its objectives of identifying and selecting persons qualified to form a pool of potential academic administrators and in providing those selected with a developmental experience designed to enhance their potential. The most direct and convincing evidence of the overall validity (.63) of program operations consists of the high rate of early attainment of status as academic administrators by former Fellows as compared with the rate for nonwinners. Although it is technically difficult to separate the effects of evaluation and selection from the impact of the internship experience, the evidence indicates that each stage of the operation contributes to meeting the program objectives. For example, a multiple correlation of .25 was obtained for the evaluation and selection variables against the career status criterion, and of .43 for the Confidential Report ratings of performance and growth during the internship.

On those characteristics deemed desirable in academic administrators, nominees were typically superior to control subjects who were not nominated for the program; Fellows were superior to nonwinners on the followup career status criterion, and they had become Fellows by virtue of their higher dossier and interview ratings. Moreover, the Fellows have almost invariably reported that the internship experience helped in their development, and their mentors have said that the Fellow's sojourn on campus was of value to the host institution.

These findings should be supplemented with systematic followups five years after the internship for each class to ascertain how far they have

progressed in their careers. Unfortunately, direct, unbiased information about the quality of the on-the-job performance of administrators, whether or not they had been Fellows, is difficult to obtain. Although one might ask presidents, administrative peers, and faculty members to rate such performance, the ratings would be of doubtful value. Actually, further career progress with respect to administrative rank, or even retention at ranks of academic dean or higher, is some evidence of quality.

The research program, though it has provided validation of the internship program, has resulted in little by way of suggested improvements. In part this is a reflection of the success of the operational program. It is easy enough to suggest new and relevant items, but most of them would cover information already available elsewhere in the program operations. The present study did indicate some need to create a small pool of items that would measure the nominee's specific administrative knowledge, and some need to obtain an early rating of persistence as a personality trait, either in the Home Evaluations or as a part of the dossier.[4]

Beyond the general finding of a high intrinsic correlation (.63) between selection and experience as a Fellow, and early attainment of a career position as an academic administrator, a number of more specific summary statements can be made with respect to the successive stages of the internship program. The statements are based in part on those research results previously reported, and in part on those presented in this followup study.

1. The nomination stage. Participation in the program by public institutions and universities has been proportionately greater than that by liberal arts, two-year, and church-related colleges, or by technical institutions. As measured by summary statistics on characteristics deemed desirable

in academic administrators, nominees have been of high quality; in fact, their quality improved in the third year of the program, after its aims were better understood. This high quality of the nominee groups has made subsequent evaluation and selection more difficult, but also more efficient.

Even though home institution ratings of nominees tend to be high, thus limiting their value, the Home Evaluation ratings have useful validity and are generally given appropriate weights in evaluating the dossier of which they are a part. Greater weight might be given to specific kinds of administrative knowledge and to persistence as a personality trait.

2. The dossier evaluation stage. Information pertaining to past scholarly achievement or to administrative experience contributes most directly to the dossier ratings of nominees. These ratings predict the results of the interview stage of evaluation and therefore have been successfully used as a prescreening device. The Mean Dossier Rating has, however, only a modest validity against the career status criterion.

3. The interview stage. The final decision to award an internship is most directly related to the Overall Interview Rating, which has been affected by the previous evaluations. The overall rating has appreciable validity against the career status criterion; since this validity is higher than those usually observed for evaluations at earlier stages, the interviews are yielding unique information that has a definite bearing on the chances of a nominee's becoming an administrator. The validities of some of the individual rating scales are higher than those computed against the award decision. Such results indicate that some shift in emphasis might be given to the various traits rated in the interview. Moreover, an overall rating is less efficient than ratings on the most valid of the specific items.

Since all nominees are considered in the selection process, evaluations

are best obtained from dossier and interview ratings, where the judges can compare nominees with each other on a uniform standard. If the qualities considered desirable in an academic administrator are to be considered the primary criteria in achieving the program objectives, then it would probably be unwise to change the existing procedures. If, on the other hand, early attainment of academic administrative status is at least one desirable outcome of the program, less emphasis should be given to personal appearance, quality of speech, and recent scholarly productions, and more emphasis should be placed on a nominee's specific knowledge and understanding of the functioning and interrelations among the components of an academic institution.

4. The internship experience. Since only those selected as Fellows have the opportunity for the internship experience, it is difficult to separate the effects of successful evaluation and selection from any impact of the internship experience itself. As previously noted, both the Fellows and their mentors emphasize the positive values of the internship, each from their own viewpoints. Little research has been done, however, on the content of the internship experience, or how it might be improved. The Fellows offer generally favorable comments, but they do not agree on what specific activities are most useful in their growth, though they emphasize the broadening of outlook on both academic and civic matters that results from contact with new people and new ideas.

We do find higher validities within the group of Fellows for the Confidential Reports of performance and growth during the internship than for the selection variables. Using a somewhat different approach, we find multiple correlations of .25 for the preinternship evaluation variables used in the selection of Fellows, .43 for Confidential Report ratings of performance and growth during the internship, and .64 for the two sets of variables

combined. These results strongly suggest that both the selection process and the internship experience play their respective roles in the program. The selection process identifies the pool of potential academic administrators, and the internship experience provides opportunities for Fellows to develop that potential, with the result that they rapidly achieve career status as academic administrators.

The ACE Academic Administration Internship Program may be judged as a successful venture justifying its initiation, The Ford Foundation's funding, and the support it has continually received from the presidents of participating institutions and from the Fellows themselves, who are probably the most direct beneficiaries. Less tangible are the long-range effects of such a program. But it seems to be supplying a pool of qualified administrative talent in a time of rapid challenges and changes in academia. Perhaps it is some of these able, younger men and women, familiar with the past but not enslaved by it, who will provide academic leadership in critical areas.

References

Astin, A. W. "Research Findings on the Academic Administration Internship Program." Educational Record, Spring 1966, 173-184.

Cox, L. "The ACE Academic Administration Internship Program." Educational Record, Spring 1966, 163-172.

Creager, J. A. "Evaluation and Selection in the 1966-67 Academic Administration Internship Program." ACE Research Report, Vol. 1, No. 3. Washington: American Council on Education, 1966.

Creager, J. A. "Evaluation and Selection of Academic Interns: 1967-68." ACE Research Reports, Vol. 6, No. 2. Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.

Technical Footnotes

[1]This statement is based on the conversion of the phi coefficient to the chi-square statistic of 46.38 (shown in Table 7) for which probability tables are available. The phi coefficient measures the actual, extrinsic relationship, useful if one is primarily interested in prediction; its maximum value is restricted by unequal marginal totals, in this case to .86. Division of phi by this maximum value yields an estimate of the intrinsic relationship on the more familiar scale of correlation, resulting in a coefficient of .63.

[2]One objection to this method of comparing the effects of selection with those of the impact of the internship experience is that it suppresses the influence of the selection variables. Ideally, all of the validity coefficients should be corrected for effects of the selection process to obtain an estimate of impact if all nominees had gone through the internship experience. Unfortunately, no sound procedure is available for doing this in the case of a dichotomous criterion where predictor variables are not normally distributed and selection is not based on a direct cutoff score. The validities of the selection variables are more drastically affected by the selection process than are the Confidential Report ratings.

[3]The multiple correlations were computed using an adaptation of the BIOMED program 02R, with an input correlation matrix computed using BIOMED program 03D, which allows for missing data. Thus, all available data on selection variables, for the nominees who returned the CSQ, and all matching data for the subgroup who became Fellows, were used. This procedure probably introduces some distortions, largely unknown, in the mathematical properties of the system of intercorrelations, but makes possible the computation of the multiple correlations required.

[4]Extensive questionnaires were administered to nominees, both Fellows and nonwinners, before and after the internship program. These questionnaires consisted of self-reports of opinions, interests, skills, traits, and activities. The resulting information was never used in the operational program, but solely in research designed to identify items which might add validity to the selection procedures, or which might indicate more specific changes occurring over time. Although some valid items were found (53 out of 374 validities against the career status criterion were in the .12 - .28 range), corresponding validities against the award criterion were as high or higher. This indicates that the valid content in the item was already implicitly available in the evaluation and selection procedures.

The few exceptional items which were valid against the career status criterion, but unrelated to the award criterion, and with face relevance to program objectives included self-ratings on Leadership, Social Self-confidence, and Ability as an Extemporaneous Speaker. In addition, similar validity patterns were found for self-ratings of strengths in General Administrative Ability, Knowledge of Students, and Knowledge of Faculty. Again, there is a suggestion that administrative knowledge might better be measured by having all nominees answer a small pool of items rather than using a single Home Evaluation rating.

In summary, the extensive search for items to improve the evaluation and selection procedures has resulted in a very small pool that might constitute a one-page nominee questionnaire to be included in the dossier. Since these results have not been cross-validated, such items should be used conservatively in evaluation.

Appendix A

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
of the American Council on Education

CAREER STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

In 1965 the American Council on Education initiated an internship program designed to identify persons interested and capable of becoming academic administrators, and to provide a selected group of the persons so identified with special experiences relevant to their professional development. As a part of the Council's efforts to evaluate this program, we seek information regarding the present career status of former candidates, and of former participants in an Academic Deans Institute. Whether or not you were among those who actually held a Council internship, we would appreciate your completing and returning this short questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Your response will be treated as confidential information. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Logan Wilson

Logan Wilson
President

1. Your name (*please print*) _____
LAST FIRST MIDDLE OR MAIDEN

2. Your present institution _____
NAME OF INSTITUTION STATE

3. Did you complete an ACE Academic Internship? *(circle one)*

Yes, in academic year 1965-66 1

Yes, in academic year 1966-67 2

Yes, in academic year 1967-68 3

No, but participated in an ACE Academic Deans Institute 4

No, but participated in some other academic management development program, under other sponsorship 5

No, I have had no such experience 6

4. Which of the following academic positions do you now hold? Have you held in the past?

(Circle one in each column)	Position I hold now	Position I held three years ago	Position I held five years ago
Department chairman	2	2	2
President of a small 4-year college or branch campus of a "system"	2	2	2
President of a junior college or 2-year branch campus	2	2	2
President of a large university or "system"	2	2	2
Academic vice-president or provost	2	2	2
Academic dean	2	2	2
Dean of students	2	2	2
Chief fiscal or business officer	2	2	2
Chief development officer	2	2	2
Full professor	2	2	2
Associate or assistant professor	2	2	2
Other or none	2	2	2

5. How often do you participate in decision-making in the following areas? *(Circle one in each row)*

Area of Decision	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely
Admissions policies	3	2	1
Faculty personnel policies	3	2	1
Financial affairs and capital improvements	3	2	1
Student affairs	3	2	1
Formal public and alumni relations	3	2	1
Individual course content	3	2	1
Curriculum structure	3	2	1

6. During the 1968-1969 academic year, what portion of your time was spent in each of the following problem areas? What was the extent of your personal concern and interest?

Problem	Fill in percent time spent	Indicate degree of personal interest and concern *(Circle one in each row)*		
		High	**Medium**	**Low**
Faculty relations		3	2	1
Budget		3	2	1
Curriculum		3	2	1
Physical plant		3	2	1
Community and public relations		3	2	1
Student unrest		3	2	1
Other student personnel		3	2	1
Development (including fund-raising)		3	2	1
Financial aid (fellowships, scholarships, and loans)		3	2	1
Alumni relations		3	2	1
Administrative coordination		3	2	1
Institution research or program planning		3	2	1
Internship matters (including serving as mentor)		3	2	1
Teaching courses		3	2	1
Doing research		3	2	1
Administering research		3	2	1
Other		3	2	1
	100%			

7. What is your annual salary before taxes, exclusive of fringe benefits, consulting and lecture fees? *(Circle one)*

Less than $10,000	1
$10,000–$14,999	2
$15,000–$19,999	3
$20,000–$24,999	4
$25,000–$29,999	5
$30,000–$34,999	6
$35,000 or more	7

8. Which of the following have you done during the last two years? *(Circle as many as apply)*

Served on local civic or political committee 2

Gave address or lecture with remuneration 2

Served as consultant on issues in higher education 2

Published on one or more administrative or policy issues in higher education 2

Served as a mentor to an academic intern 2

9. What role, and in what type of institution, do you expect to be playing in higher education five years from now? _____

_____

_____

10. **(For former interns only)** In the light of your subsequent experience, what aspects of your internship experience were most valuable? Least valuable? What changes in that experience would enhance its value for the intern's subsequent academic roles?

Most valuable: _____

_____

Least valuable: _____

_____

Recommended changes: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Other Recent Publications by the Staff of the Office of Research
American Council on Education

Astin, A. W., *Campus Disruption, 1968-69: An Analysis of Causal Factors,* **Psychology and the Problems of Society.** Washington: American Psychological Association, 1970. Pp. 377–387.

Astin, A. W., and Panos, R. J., **The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students.** Washington: The American Council on Education, 1969, 211 pp.

Astin, A. W., *Measuring Student Outputs in Higher Education,* **The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation.** Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, 1970. Pp. 75–83.

Astin, A. W., *The Methodology of Research on College Impact (1),* **Sociology of Education,** Vol. 43, No. 3, Summer, 1970. Pp. 223–254.

Astin, A. W., and Boruch, R. F., *A "Link" System for Assuring Confidentiality of Research Data in Longitudinal Studies,* **American Educational Research Journal,** Vol. 7, No. 4, November, 1970. Pp. 615–624.

Bayer, A. E., *College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 5, 1970, 48 pp.

Bayer, A. E., *Institutional Correlates of Faculty Support of Campus Unrest,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 6, No. 1, 1971, 26 pp.

Bayer, A. E., and Boruch, R. F., *The Black Student in American Colleges,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 4, No. 2, 1969, 59 pp.

Bayer, A. E., and Astin, A. W., *Violence and Disruption on the U.S. Campus: 1968-1969,* **Educational Record,** Vol. 50, No. 1, Winter, 1969. Pp. 337–350.

Bayer, A. E., Astin, A. W., and Boruch, R. F., *College Students' Attitudes Toward Social Issues: 1976-70,* **Educational Record,** Vol. 52, No. 1, Winter, 1971. Pp. 52–59.

Boruch, R. F., *A Procedure for Estimation of Trait, Method, and Error Variance Attributable To A Measure,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 30, No. 3, Autumn, 1970. Pp. 547–574.

Boruch, R. F., Larkin, J. D., Wolins, L., and McKinney, A. C., *Alternative Methods of Analysis: Multitrait-Multimethod Data,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 30, No. 4, Winter, 1970. Pp. 833–853.

Creager, J. A., *Fortran Programs Providing Weights in Survey Designs Using Stratified Samples,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 29, No. 3, Autumn, 1969. Pp. 709–712.

Creager, J. A., *A Fortran Program for the Analysis of Linear Composite Variance,* **Educational and Psychological Measurement,** Vol. 31, No. 1, Spring, 1971. Pp. 255–259.

Creager, J. A., *Evaluation and Selection of Academic Interns: 1967-1968,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 6, No. 2, 1971, 25 pp.

Creager, J. A., and Boruch, R. F., **The Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the American Council on Education.** Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1971, 7 pp.

Creager, J. A., and Sell, C. L., *The Institutional Domain of Higher Education: A Characteristics File for Research,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 4, No. 6, 1969, 63 pp.

Drew, D. E., *A Profile of the Jewish Freshman,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 4, 1970, 53 pp.

Drew, D. E., *On the Allocation of Federal Funds for Science Education,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 7, 1970, 44 pp.

Drew, D. E., *Undergraduates Planning a Career in Medicine,* **Report of the Ninth Annual Conference on Research in Medical Education.** Washington: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1970. Pp. 215–220.

Folger, J. K., Astin, H. S., and Bayer, A. E., **Human Resources and Higher Education.** New York: Russell Sage, 1970, 475 pp.

Staff of the Office of Research, *National Norms for Entering College Freshmen—Fall 1970,* **ACE Research Reports,** Vol. 5, No. 6, 1970, 100 pp.